Preparatory Committee for the 2020 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

Distr.: General
29 August 2018

Original: English

Second session
23 April–4 May 2018

Summary record of the 19th meeting
Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Friday, 4 May 2018, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Bugajski ..... (Poland)

Contents

Report on the results of the session to the next session of the Preparatory Committee (*continued*)

Any other matters

Closure of the session

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent as soon as possible to the Chief of the Documents Management Section (dms@un.org).

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org/).

18-08757 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

Report on the results of the session to the next session of the Preparatory Committee (*continued*) (NPT/CONF.2020/PC.II/CRP.3)

1. **Ms. Melon** (Argentina) said that the Chair's factual summary was comprehensive and fair. The current session had highlighted the urgent need to identify areas of common ground that would enable States parties to bring the review process to a successful conclusion. Many delegations, including her own, had underlined the need to nominate the President of the 2020 Review Conference as soon as possible.

2. **Mr. Ağacıkoğlu** (Turkey) said that many references had been made to the joint comprehensive plan of action during the current session. States had not only reiterated their support for the deal, but had also underlined the importance of preserving it. Concern had been expressed at ongoing uncertainty regarding the future of the plan. Those matters should have been better reflected in the summary.

3. **Mr. Jato** (Sweden) said that overall, the Chair's factual summary was a fair reflection of the discussions that had taken place. Those discussions had been a valuable means of clarifying national positions as the 2020 Review Conference approached. During the remainder of the current review cycle, States parties should focus on producing tangible results under the three pillars of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, namely, non-proliferation, disarmament and the peaceful use of nuclear energy, which would lay the foundations for a successful 2020 Review Conference. It was also necessary to discuss the implementation of the commitments made at the 1995, 2000 and 2010 review conferences, which remained valid. The success of the 2020 Review Conference depended on the ability of both nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States to engage in a spirit of cooperation and compromise, with the overall objective being to reaffirm the vitality of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

4. **Ms. Cervenka** (Norway) said that although the discussions at the current session had demonstrated that States parties held different views on how to achieve and maintain their shared goal of a world free of nuclear weapons, they had also shown that those States all agreed on the centrality of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. That point was made clearly in document NPT/CONF.2020/PC.II/12 containing the Chair's reflections on the status of the Treaty. The session had also provided delegations with the opportunity to discuss important issues such as how to strengthen the review process and mainstream the gender dimension.

5. Welcoming the Chair's factual summary, she said it should be borne in mind that the summary was not a negotiated document, and merely reflected the Chair's assessment of delegations' deliberations. It would provide valuable assistance in their preparations for the 2020 Review Conference. In that regard, the President of the Conference should be nominated as soon as possible.

6. **Mr. Alghunaim** (Kuwait) said that, although he appreciated that it was difficult for the Chair to draw up a factual summary that was to the satisfaction of all States parties, the summary did not accurately reflect the remarks made by the representatives of numerous groups and States, including Kuwait. Paragraph 84 of document NPT/CONF.2020/PC.II/CRP.3 sought to highlight a single, isolated view that the creation of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction could be achieved only through direct dialogue among all States of the region. That idea was reiterated in paragraph 86, which also placed the onus on the States of the region to establish such a zone, without mentioning the efforts already undertaken by the Arab States in that regard. It was regrettable that paragraph 85 indicated that the States of the region bore the same responsibility as the sponsors of the resolution on the Middle East adopted at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. That was neither an opinion that had been expressed by the vast majority of States parties nor one that was reflected in the final documents of the 2000 and 2010 review conferences or the text of the resolution itself. Thus, the summary emphasized a single point of view, incorporated elements from outside the scope of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and imposed on Arab States conditions that not only ran counter to the statements of the majority of States parties but also the basic principles and agreements adopted at previous review conferences. Furthermore, the summary did not reflect the affirmation by Arab States that all of them, including the State of Palestine, were party to the Treaty and had signed comprehensive safeguards agreements with IAEA. The only regional exception was Israel, which had neither signed the Treaty nor placed its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. The summary failed to mention the demand made by the international community for Israel to take those steps, which would facilitate the creation of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction.

7. **Mr. Baddoura** (Lebanon) said that, while he recognized that the production of a comprehensive factual summary was a challenging task, it was important for the summary to be balanced and to accurately and honestly reflect the fundamental positions of States as a means of contributing to the success of the 2020 Review Conference. However, the section of the summary dealing with the Middle East was not sufficiently balanced, since it did not refer to the positions of a large number of States that had called on Israel to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and place all its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. The summary also failed to mention that Israel was the only State in the Middle East that had not acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, a situation that undermined the credibility of the Treaty and was impeding progress in implementing the 1995 resolution. His delegation looked forward to engaging in serious deliberations at the next session of the Preparatory Committee and the 2020 Review Conference, and hoped that those deliberations would provide renewed impetus to efforts and mechanisms to implement the 1995 resolution, in order to protect the Middle East from the spectre of nuclear threats.

8. **Mr. Davison** (Canada) said that overall, the Chair's factual summary was a balanced and comprehensive reflection of the discussions that had taken place. However, he was concerned by the change in scope and content of the paragraph on gender, namely paragraph 10, compared to the factual summary of the Chair of the Preparatory Committee's previous session, set out in document NPT/CONF.2020/PC.I/WP.40. The pursuit of equality in the context of the Non-Proliferation Treaty was a matter not only of participation but also of acknowledging that the impact of nuclear weapons on women and girls was different from its impact on men and boys.

9. His country had particularly appreciated the discussion of how to strengthen the review process. A current theme of delegations' informal discussions had been the question of how delegations could work more effectively in the greater interest of the Treaty. A range of proposals had been formulated, which he hoped would be further developed at the Preparatory Committee's next session and the 2020 Review Conference.

10. **Mr. Rowland** (United Kingdom) said that since the Chair's summary was produced under his sole responsibility and would not be amended, the United Kingdom would not make comments or repeat positions it had already expressed. The Preparatory Committee's next session, in 2019, would provide an opportunity for States parties to agree on recommendations. He suggested that they should start by working on areas of agreement, rather than focusing on the all-too-evident areas of disagreement. Recommendations relating to those areas of agreement would make a useful contribution to the 2020 Review Conference.

11. **Mr. Kadiri** (Nigeria) said that in general, the Chair's factual summary was fair and balanced. However, it was regrettable that the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons was not given due attention in paragraph 40 of the summary. He hoped that that would not be the case with respect to future summaries. He reaffirmed the importance that Nigeria attached to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and looked forward to a fruitful outcome to the Preparatory Committee's next session.

12. **Mr. Sidharta** (Indonesia) said that while he appreciated the Chair's factual summary, it did not reflect the support for and commitment to the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons as expressed by the overwhelming majority of States parties. The reality was that most countries believed that nuclear weapons should be entirely eliminated. That fact should be reflected in the factual summary and taken into consideration in implementing the three pillars of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Moreover, more balanced views must be reflected in the summary with a view to identifying common ground as a means of strengthening the review cycle. His country reaffirmed its commitment to the review process, and supported the continuation of enhanced regional dialogue and consultations before the Preparatory Committee's next session.

13. **Mr. Alwasil** (Saudi Arabia) said that the Chair's factual summary failed to reflect several points that had been discussed at the current session and that were set out in working papers submitted by States parties. In particular, the text did not adequately reflect the view that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East should be one of the aims of the 2020 Review Conference, given that the review conferences were the principal forums for reviewing the implementation of the 1995 resolution. A conference must be held to launch a process to negotiate, without preconditions, a legally binding instrument on the establishment of such a zone in the Middle East. The summary also failed to refer to the opposition expressed by several States parties to attempts to make the signature of additional protocols a prerequisite for States to access the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Such attempts undermined the objective of universal implementation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

14. **Mr. Anwar** (Malaysia) expressed his delegation's readiness to continue the important work already carried

out during the current review cycle. Malaysia looked forward to engaging actively with other States parties and stakeholders to ensure the success of the Preparatory Committee's next session, and was counting on their cooperation, support and constructive participation. The principles of inclusivity, transparency, diversity and mutual understanding and respect would guide their work as they approached the 2020 Review Conference.

15. **Mr. Najafi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the discussions that had taken place at both the previous and the current meeting highlighted the deep dissatisfaction of the non-nuclear-weapon States with the Chair's factual summary, which contrasted with the satisfaction of the nuclear-weapon States.

Any other matters

16. **Ms. Guitton** (France) said that she wished to present a joint statement entitled "Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons: addressing the nuclear challenge of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea", which had been endorsed by the following 63 States: Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

17. The joint statement read:

> "We, States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, stress that the nuclear tests, including the latest on 3 September 2017, and the launches using ballistic missile technology, in particular of intercontinental range, conducted by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea are in clear violation of multiple unanimously agreed Security Council resolutions, and reiterate the international community's strong condemnation of these actions as expressed in the relevant Security Council resolutions.
>
> The nuclear weapon and ballistic missile programmes of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the extent of the progress achieved by the regime pose a grave and increasing threat to regional and international peace and security.
>
> The pursuit by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea of military nuclear and ballistic missile programmes also constitutes a grave threat to the international non-proliferation regime, of which the Non-Proliferation Treaty remains the cornerstone. We remain determined to preserve the non-proliferation regime and to strengthen the Treaty.
>
> We acknowledge the recent statement by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea announcing the suspension of nuclear tests and ballistic missile launches and the closing of its nuclear test site as a first step towards the complete, verifiable and irreversible denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula.
>
> We welcome the inter-Korean summit held on 27 April 2018 and the "Panmunjeom Declaration". We emphasize the importance of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea taking concrete actions and express our hopes for progress at the scheduled United States-Democratic People's Republic of Korea summit and through ensuing efforts by all relevant parties.
>
> We continue to urge the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to return to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards at an early date and abandon its nuclear weapon and ballistic missile programmes in a complete, verifiable and irreversible manner.
>
> To this end, we reaffirm that we will faithfully and scrupulously implement and enforce the relevant Security Council resolutions and will further strengthen international cooperation."

18. **Ms. Kemppainen** (Observer for the European Union) said that the Chair's leadership and diplomatic skills had enabled delegations to conduct their discussions efficiently and effectively and in a constructive atmosphere. The European Union welcomed the Chair's efforts to build on the Preparatory Committee's previous session and ensure continuity throughout the review process, and encouraged the Chairs of all three sessions of the current review cycle to continue to cooperate closely to pave the way for a successful 2020 Review Conference, with a view to reaffirming the centrality of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and collective support for the Treaty's three pillars and its full and universal implementation.

Closure of the session

19. **The Chair** said that at the current session, the States parties had comprehensively reviewed the implementation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, resolved all procedural issues and established a basis on which to commence the Preparatory Committee's next session. Furthermore, they had discussed political issues of relevance to the disarmament and non-proliferation regime. Although there had been some disagreement on substantive issues, many practical proposals had been made that had enriched their discussions and provided new perspectives on how to achieve the Treaty's objectives more effectively. States parties now had a better understanding of each other's positions and motivations, which would serve them well at the 2020 Review Conference. The substantial contributions of many delegations to the discussions demonstrated the strong credentials of the States that those delegations represented with regard to the Treaty. Fruitful discussions had also been held on how to strengthen the review process. States parties had reaffirmed the value they attached to the Treaty and the benefits it provided. He hoped that that sense of common purpose would be preserved throughout the remainder of the review process.

20. His efforts to understand the positions, motivations and concerns of States parties in the year before the current session, which was a new practice, gave everyone a greater sense of "ownership" of the review process. The States parties had managed to discuss all relevant topics across the three clusters, maintained a constructive and business-like atmosphere, and adhered to the schedule. Although fewer States parties had participated in the current session than in the previous one, the number and quality of their statements more than compensated for that fact. The election of the Chair of the Preparatory Committee's next session was a significant achievement that further consolidated the consensus built during the current review cycle, and he hoped that the President of the 2020 Review Conference would be nominated without further delay. The current session had established useful building blocks for a successful 2020 Review Conference.

21. *After an exchange of courtesies, the Chair declared the second session of the Preparatory Committee closed.*

The meeting rose at 3.50 p.m.